

REMARKS

Claims 19-33 remain pending in the application, withdrawn claims 1-18 and 34-41 being canceled subsequent to having been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner.

IDS

The Examiner indicated that the Applicants' prior art reference, U.S. Patent No. 6,078,690, was not considered because the inventor name is allegedly incorrectly listed.

Attached herewith is a new IDS providing the correct inventor name for U.S. Patent No. 6,078,690. The Applicants thank the Examiner for pointing out the error.

35 USC 112 First Paragraph Rejection of Claims 20, 25 and 30

The Office Action rejected claims 20, 25 and 30 as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement under 35 USC 112. In particular, the Examiner alleged that the Applicants' disclosure fails to support the claimed "said server is a least recently used protocol gateway".

Claims 20, 25 and 30 have been carefully reviewed and are amended herein where appropriate. It is respectfully submitted that claims 20, 25 and 30 are now in full conformance with 35 USC 112. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 19-33 over Oehrke

Claims 19-33 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 7,047,300 to Oehrke ("Oehrke"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 19-33 recite an authenticator to authenticate that a particular source of a message is an authorized user of a messaging network before the message is routed by the message router between a protocol gateway and a server.

Oehrke explains that a data center provides various applications

and associated data for customers or owners, e.g., company A, who may use the data center for its intranet network. (Oehrke, col. 7, lines 42-45). Once company A has been authenticated, then the "users of intranet network 54 are provided with access to the data center 52." (Oehrke, col. 7, lines 48-50).


Thus, Oehrke teaches authentication of a "company A" to allow its users to access a data center. Authentication of a "company A" to allow its users to access a data center is not authentication that a particular source of a message is an authorized user of a messaging network, much less such authentication being performed **before** the message is routed by a message router between a protocol gateway and a server, as recited by claims 19-33.

For at least all the above reasons, claims 19-33 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William H. Bollman
Reg. No.: 36,457
Tel. (202) 261-1020
Fax. (202) 887-0336

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC
2000 M Street, N.W. 7th Floor
Washington D.C. 20036-3307
WHB/df